

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Case No. 19-CR-00779

Plaintiff,

-vs-

JUDGE PAMELA A. BARKER

ANTONIO WOODS,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND
ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Antonio Woods' Motion to Reconsider filed on August 5, 2021 ("Defendant's Motion"). (Doc. No. 35.) Although Defendant did not specifically identify the decision or order he is asking this Court to reconsider, it is apparent from a review of Defendant's Motion that he is asking this Court to reconsider its decision denying Defendant's Motion to Restructure Sentences Under § 3584 and U.S.S.G. §5G1.3 ("Defendant's original motion"), issued on July 13, 2021. (Doc. No. 31.) On August 10, 2021, the United States of America filed the Government's Response In Opposition To Defendant's Motion. (Doc. No. 36.)

In Defendant's Motion, Defendant claims that although the Government has argued that the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas Court docket for Case No CR-19-645162 demonstrates that a personal bond was set and posted by Defendant on October 21, 2021, he was not released on that personal bond, but remained in state custody. Defendant argues that since he was never released on that bond, and his "arrest for this matter came from the arrest on October 18th, 2019 incident, then the time for that should be credited in this matter, irregardless of the determination of the State Probation violation." (Doc. No. 35, PageID # 240.) Defendant argues

that the time spent incarcerated for the state violation associated with his firearm charge should run concurrent to the time imposed by this Court.

The Government asserts that even assuming Defendant was not released on a personal bond in state court, and remained in custody due to the violation of parole in his previous state case, its' arguments set forth in its opposition to Defendant's original motion remain unchanged. So, too, do the bases for this Court's original decision denying Defendant's original motion. Defendant does not set any new justification for this Court to reconsider its original decision denying Defendant's original motion.

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 7, 2021

s/Pamela A. Barker
PAMELA A. BARKER
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE